BRILL

Vivarium 47 (2009) 375-406

VIVA RIUM

brill.nl/viv

Balliol 63 and Parisian Theology around 1320*

William J. Courtenay
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Abstract
The article provides a survey of the content of Balliol College 63, with special attention to the questions of Gerard of Siena. It establishes that many of the texts in the first half of the manuscript (ff. 1r-88v) are pre-edited versions written at Paris in the 1317-1321 period. To illustrate that point, Gerard of Siena's question on whether the articles of faith are the principles of theology is edited in the appendices in its pre-edited (Balliol 63) and final form as edited by Gerard in the 1320s.

Keywords
Balliol College Ms. 63, Gerard of Siena, Peter Auriol, Thomas Wylton, Dionysius de Burgo, Henricus de Alemania junior, articles of faith, subject of theology

Balliol College Oxford cod. 63 has attracted the attention of scholars of medieval philosophy and theology for more than a century, largely because of the questions of Peter Auriol and Thomas Wylton contained in it.[1] The most recent advances in our knowledge of this manuscript have been devoted to those very questions, some of which were edited by Lauge Nielsen in *Vivarium* not long ago.[2] Yet the manuscript has a rich array of other texts worthy of

*) I am indebted to Penelope Bulloch of Balliol College Oxford for allowing me frequent visits to study Balliol 63 and several other manuscripts in that collection. I would also like to thank David Pavelich in Special Collections at the University of Chicago Library, Gregory Pass of the Vatican Film Library in St. Louis, and the staff of the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome for granting me access to the other manuscripts used in this study.

1) N. Valois, "Pierre Auriol, frère mineur," in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 33 (1906), 479-528, at 502, 507-508; A. Maier, *Ausgehendes Mittelalter*, vol. I (Rome, 1964), pp. 15, 92; B. Nardi, *Studi su Pietro Pomponazzi* (Florence, 1965), pp. 340-48.

2) L. O. Nielsen, "The Debate between Peter Auriol and Thomas Wylton on Theology and Virtue," *Vivarium*, 38 (2000), 35-98.

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2009 DOI: 10.1163/004275409X12482627895203

study. A few of them, such as John of Lana's *Questiones de anima* and Dionysius de Burgo's opening question from his commentary on the *Sentences*, are so identified in the manuscript but remain largely unstudied. Many other texts are anonymous.[3] Work on the manuscript has been slowed and at times discouraged by the difficulty in deciphering the small scribal hand, much of it faded and tightly packed in its double-column format. The significance of the contents already identified and the possibility of uncovering additional treasures has kept it in the sights of numerous scholars across the years.

The first detailed description of the manuscript was provided by Henry Octavius Coxe in his catalogue of manuscripts in Oxford colleges.[4] Among the twenty-two items he noted, including the questions by Auriol and Wylton, Coxe listed works and authors so identified in the manuscript, such as Dionysius de Burgo, John of Lana, Giles of Rome, John Beverley, and what he thought was a work authored by William Woodford, as well as the names of authors cited in those and in other works that were anonymous. He even offered a guess as to the identity of the author of a group of questions (60r-66r) attributed in the margin to 'Ger', which he thought might belong to Gerson or Gerard of Siena.

Unfortunately, his conjectures were passed over in silence by later scholars. Victorin Doucet noted that the first question in that group, "Utrum deus sub absoluta ratione deitatis sit subiectum in theologia," has an almost identical title as a question in the last part of Amiens 234, which also contains a question attributed to Gerard of St. Victor.[5] Consequently Doucet rejected Bar-

---

3) F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium Commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi* (Würzburg, 1947), pp. 481-82, included six groups of anonymous questions (nn. 1196-1200, and 1199.1), some of which can now be matched with authors.

4) H. Coxe, *Catalogus codicum mss., qui in collegiis aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur*, vol. I, section: *Catalogus codicum mss. Collegii Balliolensis* (Oxford, 1852; repr. 1972), pp. 16-17.

5) V. Doucet, *Commentaires sur les Sentences. Supplément au Répertoire de M. Frédéric Stegmueller* (Firenze-Quaracchi, 1954, reprinted from *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 47 (1954), 66-170, 400-427), p. 33: "Le rapprochement du ms. Balliol et de celui d'Amiens, où l'on retrouve, semble-t-il, la même question sur l'objet de la théologie, invite plutôt à voir dans ces fragments des extraits du Commentaire de Gérard de S. Victor. Ce rapprochement est du moins intéressant et méritait d'être signalé." For a description of the Amiens manuscript see E. Coyecque, *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques de France. Départements*, tom. 19: *Amiens* (Paris, 1893), pp. 114-15; the manuscript today is shelved under D.234. The question in Amiens D.234, "utrum deus sub absoluta ratione sue dietatis et essentie sit subiectum in theologia," begins on fol. 296r (53r in original numbering), and the mention of Gerard of St. Victor occurs on 283r (40r), not 282r as in Coyecque and Doucet.

tholomaeus Xiberta's hypothesis that questions attributed to 'Gerardus' in Balliol 63 might belong to the Carmelite master, Gerard of Bologna, and proposed instead that those on 60r-66r belonged to the Parisian theologian, Gerard of St. Victor, O.S.A.[6] A closer examination of both Balliol 63 and Amiens 234, however, reveals a very different and more complex textual landscape.[7] After a century and a half of other proposed candidates, one of Coxe's two guesses turned out to be correct. The author of the questions on 60r-66r is Gerard of Siena, O.E.S.A.

In working with the manuscript Konstanty Michalski noted that the version of Auriol's questions on book II of the *Sentences* in Balliol 63 was shorter than that of the printed text, and was therefore either a primitive redaction or a later abbreviation, but probably not an official *reportatio*.[8] Michalski first favored viewing it as a primitive redaction, especially because the manuscript, written in the first half of the fourteenth century, also contains a rare exchange ("unique en son genre") between Peter Auriol and Thomas Wylton—the questions edited by Nielsen.[9] In the end Michalski called it an abbreviation, and although he recognized that the exchange occurred when Auriol and Wylton were regent masters in theology, he mistakenly located the exchange as taking place at Oxford rather than Paris.

Further work on the manuscript was undertaken by Franz Pelster. In the first of three articles he called attention to the fact that many of the texts in the first half of the manuscript were by Augustinian Hermits.[10] This was obviously true for John of Lana and Dionysius de Burgo San Sepulchro, but Pelster ascertained that it was also true for the anonymous questions on ff. 57r-60r and 67r-85v. Moreover, he identified the "questio Gerardi in principio tertii"

---

6) For the Gerard of Bologna hypothesis, see B. M. Xiberta, *De Scriptoribus scholasticis saec. XIV ex ordine Carmelitarum* (Louvain, 1931), p. 78, n. 2. Xiberta, however, was referring to two later questions in Balliol 63 attributed to Gerard, from a commentary on books III and IV of the *Sentences*, to be discussed below.

7) On the Amiens manuscript see W. J. Courtenay, "Gerard of St. Victor and Amiens 234," to appear in *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale*, 51 (2009).

8) K. Michalski, "Le criticisme et le scepticisme dans la philosophie du XIV^{e} siècle," *Bulletin de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences et des Lettres. Classe d'histoire et de philosophie*, année 1925 (Cracow, 1926), 41-122, at 43; repr. in Michalski, *La philosophie au XIV^{e} siècle. Six études*, ed. K. Flasch (Frankfurt, 1969), 67-149, at 70.

9) See above, note 2.

10) F. Pelster, "Zur Überlieferung des Quodlibet und anderer Schriften des Petrus Aureoli O.F.M.," *Franciscan Studies*, 14 (1954), 392-411, at 395-96, 398-406.

on 87v as possibly belonging to Gerard of Siena. In his second article he added the possibility that the questions on ff. 60r-66r were also by an Augustinian Hermit (but without conjecturing any specific person), and that the Augustinian author of the questions on ff. 67r-85v was English because he cited William of Ware and Robert Cowton, whom Pelster believed only taught at Oxford, and because Scotus was cited as Duns.[11] This stage of research was brought together in a detailed reexamination of the content of the manuscript by R.A.B. Mynors, who included a helpful analysis of its quire structure.[12] Because of the inclusion of texts by John Beverley and Robert Winchelsey in the latter part of the manuscript as well as his belief that the early part contained texts by Gerard of St. Victor or Gerard of Bologna, Mynors dated the contents of the manuscript to the first two decades of the fourteenth century, and the manuscript itself between 1320 and 1350.

In recent years considerable progress has been made in deciphering the content of Balliol 63. Through a reexamination of the manuscript John Clark, identified Gerard of Siena as the author of the questions on ff. 60r-66r and provided a detailed analysis and partial transcription of the questions of the Augustinian anonymous on ff. 67r-85v.[13] Lauge Nielsen, in numerous articles, has further advanced our knowledge of sections of Balliol 63 and reopened the possibility that some of the texts are pre-publication versions of questions rather than later abbreviations after publication.[14]

---

11) F. Pelster, "Zur ersten Polemik gegen Aureoli: Raymundus Bequini O.P., seine Quästionen und sein Correctorium Petri Aureoli, Das Quodlibet des Jacobus de Apamis O.E.S.A.," *Franciscan Studies*, 15 (1955), 30-47, at 31. See also Pelster, "Kleine Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte der Scholastik. Cod. 739 der Stadtbibliothek Toulouse mit teilweise unbekannten Quästionen des Thomas von Sutton O.P., Aegidius Romanus und Heinrich von Friemar O.E.S.A.," *Scholastik*, 32 (1957), 247-255.

12) R. A. B. Mynors, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College Oxford* (Oxford, 1963), pp. 43-49. Drawing on Mynors, Francis Roth, *The English Austin Friars, 1249-1538*, vol. I (New York, 1966), pp. 598-599, highlighted the Augustinian authors in the manuscript.

13) J. P. H. Clark, "Authorship in Ms. Balliol College, Oxford, 63," *Analecta Augustiniana* (henceforth *AA*), 54 (1991), 81-114.

14) In addition to the article in *Vivarium* cited above in note 2, see L. O. Nielsen, "The Intelligibility of Faith and the Nature of Theology—Peter Auriol's Theological Programme," *Studia Theologica*, 53 (1999), 26-39; "Auriol's Way with Words. The Genesis of Peter Auriol's Commentaries on Peter Lombard's First and Fourth Books of the *Sentences*," in *Mediaeval Commentaries on the* Sentences *of Peter Lombard. Current Research*, vol. 1, ed. G. R. Evans (Leiden-Boston-Köln, 2002), pp. 149-219; "The *Quodlibet* of Peter Auriol," in *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages. The Fourteenth Century*, ed. C. Schabel (Leiden-Boston, 2007), pp. 267-331, at 267-71.

In order better to determine the date, context, and character of the texts in this manuscript, including those of Auriol and Wylton, we need to expand on the codicological approach taken by Coxe, Pelster, Mynors, and Clark. The purpose of the present article is to provide a more detailed survey of the content of the first half of Balliol 63, which once circulated separately from the later quires, to identify more of the anonymous authors and those cited, to establish the time-frame in which these questions were written and collected, and to present evidence that several of the texts included in the manuscript, perhaps most, are early, pre-publication versions. It will also be shown that many of the authors in the first half of the manuscript were Augustinian Hermits, as Pelster noted, that the person who collected the texts was probably an English Austin Friar, and that all the texts in the first ten quires of the manuscript (1r-88v), with the exception of some questions of Giles of Rome on one folio and perhaps the questions on ff. 67r-85v, can now be dated to 1317-1321 and copied soon thereafter. Before discussing these issues, an overview of the structure and content of the manuscript will be useful.

Balliol 63

The manuscript once belonged to the private library of William Gray, bishop of Ely, and was bequeathed to Balliol College after Gray's death in 1478. Mynors made a careful analysis of the contents of this manuscript, noting missing leaves, which he presumed were cut out because they were blank. Mynors recognized that both the double-column portions as well as the single-column section (ff. 67r-85v) inserted into that structure were in an English scribal hand. He also noted the high proportion of texts from Augustinian Hermits, remarked on earlier by Franz Pelster, pointing to an English Augustinian provenance for the manuscript.

Quires 1-2 (ff. 1r-18v):

ff. 1ra-17vb: "Conclusiones mag. Petri Aureoly super secundum Sententiarum," in a tiny hand in two columns.

ff. 18r is blank and 18v contains the *tabula questionum* for Auriol's questions.

Quire 3 (19r-23v):

ff. 19ra-19va: "Utrum virtus, in quantum virtus, sit ens per accidens" (*Determinatio* of Auriol, later circulated as *Quodlibet*, q. 11, edited by Nielsen, "The Debate," pp. 65-75).

ff. 19va-20rb: "Utrum habitus theologicus sit practicus vel speculativus" (Thomas Wylton, disputed question, edited by Nielsen, "The Debate," pp. 76-89)

ff. 20va-21vb: Petrus Aureoli, *Questiones quodlibetales*[15]

ff. 20va-20vb: Auriol, *Quodlibet*, q. 2: "Utrum actio differat a forma agendi tamquam res alia."

ff. 21ra-21va: Auriol, *Quodlibet*, q. 15: "Utrum habitus practicus et speculativus distinguantur ab invicem per esse principium activum et non esse principium activum in ipso sciente." (edited by Nielsen, "The Debate," pp. 90-98)

ff. 21va-21vb: Auriol, *Quodlibet*, q. 5: "Utrum sola distinctio rationis facta per intellectum sufficiat ad tollendum omnem contradictionem in divinis."

ff. 21vb: Auriol, *Quodlibet*, q. 8: "Utrum ad visionem beatificam requiratur similitudo creata."

ff. 22ra-22vb [Stegmüller, *Repertorium*, nr. 1196]. Top margin of 22ra: "Questio super primum Sententiarum." Text: "Quia supponitur in lectione quod deus sit subiectum in hac scientia, ideo quero de ratione formali sub qua deus habeat hic poni subiectum, et est questio ista: Utrum deus sit hic subiectum sub alia ratione magis speciali et magis contracta quam sit absoluta ratio deitatis. Quod sic, quia absoluta ratio deitatis est formaliter infinita; igitur sub illa non est deus subiectum. Antecedens probatur, quia illud est formaliter infinitum, quia omne sibi annexum facit infinitum." Cites favorably the opinion of Giles of Rome, referred to in the text as "opinio doctoris." The text of this question differs from the structure and content of a similar question by Gerard of Siena later in this manuscript (60ra-60rb), and from the question on the same subject in Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri, *Sent*. I, Prologue, q 2: "Utrum deus sit subiectum sub ratione contracta."[16]

ff. 23ra: "Utrum viator possit naturaliter pervenire ad cognoscendum omnia saluti sue necessaria. Et probatur quod sic, quia activo naturali et passivo

---

15) For a discussion of these questions, see Nielsen, "The Debate," 35-98.

16) This is the title given by Damasus Trapp, "The Quaestiones of Dionysius de Burgo O.S.A.," *Augustinianum*, 3 (1963), 63-78, at 64. Dionysius, however, handled that subject in the body of quest. 1, and the second question of his prologue in Erfurt, CA 2° 131, 12ra, begins: "Quia in questione precedenti dictum est quod deus est subiectum in theologia sub ratione contracta et non absoluta, ideo queritur: Utrum hic [deus] sit subiectum sub ratione absoluta, quia prima scientia debet habere primum subiectum sub prima ratione; sed theologia est prima scientia; ergo etc."

approximatis adinvicem et non impeditis sequitur actio. Sed activum respectu omnis omnes intelligibiles est intellectus agens, et passivum est intellectus possibilis, et ista sunt naturaliter in anima, nec sunt impedita; igitur respectu cuiuscumque, quia secundum Philosophum, 3 *De anima*. . . ." After three-fourths of a column the text breaks off: "Et secundum hoc possumus loqui de adequatione dupliciter. Uno modo secundum potentiam naturalem, et sic loquendo dico quod obiectum adequatum intellectus nostri"

ff. 23rb-23vb: Principial sermon, or *Lectio in librum Ecclesiastes*: "Vanitas vanitatum etc. [Eccle. 1:2]. Secundum quod dicit beatus Augustinus, secundo libro *de doctrina christiana* . . . Quorum consorcio nos coniungat rex omnium seculorum. Amen." Mynors gives additional transcription. This is not the principial sermon for Dionysius de Burgo, who chose as his text Act. 10:9: "Ascendit Petrus ad superiora domus, etc."

Quires 4-6 (ff. 24r-33v, 34r-45v, 46r-56v):

ff. 24ra-26rb: in top margin of 24ra: "Frater Dyonisius de Burgo OESA."[17] Text: "Utrum finis per se sacre scripture in via sit amare deum. Et arguitur quod non, quia in scientia theologie est deus subiectum sub absoluta ratione, igitur. . . ." The question is only two-thirds complete. There are marginal citations to Henricus [de Gandavo], Egidius, Herveus, [Robertus] Couton, Scotus, Thomas, Albertus, H. de Almannia in prologo libri ethicorum [i.e., Henry of Friemar, senior], W. de Alnewyk, and 'Go.' [whom Mynors identified as "Godeham?", but is almost certainly a reference to Godfrey of Fontaines]. With the exception of Thomas and Albert (unless a different Albert is being cited), these are all authors active at Paris at some point in the first two decades of the fourteenth century.

ff. 26v-27r blank

f. 27va: Index of questions of John de Lana

f. 27vb: "Conclusiones Aureoli de tempore"

ff. 28ra-51va: "Fratris Johannis de Lana de Bononia [Bologna], bacellarii in sacra pagina ordinis fratrum heremitarum sancti Augustini, Questiones de anima." On a cedula in the same hand as the text and inserted between 29v and 30r is an argument that is identified as that of F[ratris] Johannes

---

17) Dionysius de Burgo Sancti Sepulchri presumably came from Sansepolcro near Arezzo. The question in Balliol 63 is from his commentary on Sent. I, Prologue, quest. 1, and is incomplete. The only other manuscript of Dionysius' commentary is Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Allgemein-Bibliothek, CA 2º 131, ff. 1r-153v.

de Roma.[18] And in the margin of 35ra there is another note: "Nota istam imaginem et est Johannis de Roma." Another note at bottom of 31rb, which begins: "Ad istam conclusionem arguit Harkelay sic: illa necessitate qua deus est deus, est trinitatis…" ends with "---- R[esponsio?] Vasconis."[19] And on 41v, bottom margin: "[opinio] Paynotis," which is a reference to Johannes Pagnotta, or Paignote, de Sancta Victoria, O.E.S.A.[20] Finally, on the bottom margin of 49v is the name "Glatton," which Mynors, p. 45, took to be the name of the rubricator, but which Roth, p. 598, suggested might refer to Roger Glatton (Glacton), O.E.S.A., DTh at Cambridge and Prior Provincial in England in 1334.[21]

ff. 51va-51vb: "Lectio in Sententias" in the margin of a text that follows immediately after the Lana text. This is a principial sermon, which begins: "Fluvius egrediebatur de loco vo[luptatis] ad irri[gandum] parad[isum] qui inde dividitur in quatuor cap[ita]. Gen. ii [2:10]. Beatus Gregorius, 18 Moralium super illud Job 28 [28:11]: 'profunda quoque fluviorum etc.'…." Explicit: "…ad irrigandum, ipse enim 'facit magna et inscrutabilia absque numero, qui dat pluviam super faciem terre, et irrigat aquis universa,' Job 5[:9-10], et non cuiuscumque aquis, sed illis de quibus

---

18) Johannes Parentii de Roma, dictus Cacantius, was at Paris in the lectorate program in 1298-1301 [*AA* 2 (1907-1908), pp. 436, 481, 483], not to be confused with Johannes Gentilis de Roma, bac. Parisien. and provincial of the Roman province of the Order, who died in 1303 [*AA* 3 (1909-1910), p. 53]. John Parentii de Roma was *sententiarius* at Paris c. 1307-1308, subsequently was elected Prior Provincial, and at the General Chapter at Padua in 1315 was chosen to return to Paris for the magisterium, which he obtained on November 30, 1319 [*AA* 3, 54-56; 5 (1913), 205-206]. He is presumably identical with the Johannes Parentii, O.E.S.A., who in 1329 while in Avignon also served as a papal scribe [CUP II, pp. 321-322, #887]. It is unclear whether he is cited in Balliol 63 for opinions expressed in his questions on the *Sentences* or, more likely, for those expressed as regent master in 1319-1320.

19) Possibly a reference to Gerardus de Vasconibus de Pergamo (Bergamo), O.E.S.A., who read the *Sentences* at Paris in the early 1320s and incepted at Paris in 1332 or 1333. But if 'Vasconis' was replying directly to Harclay, it would have to be before 1312 at Paris or, if at Oxford, before 1317. Another possibility is that the name is a spelling variant for 'Baconis', possibly referring to John Baconthorp, who is often cited that way and who read the *Sentences* at Paris in 1319-1320 or 1320-1321, and might simply be critiquing a position that Harlcay had defended earlier. On Baconthrop see Xiberta, *De Scriptoribus*, pp. 168-172.

20) Pagnotta read the *Sentences* at Paris c. 1306-1307 and was cited by Prosper de Reggio-Emilia; he was apparently promoted to the magisterium c. November 1317 and would have been regent master there in 1318-1319. As with John Parentii, it is uncertain if the opinion cited in Balliol 63 is from his questions on the *Sentences* or from his time as regent master. See I. Arámburu, "De fratre Joanne Pagnotta de S. Victoria O.E.S.A.," *AA* 19 (1943-1944), 141-168.

21) Roth, *English Austin Friars*, pp. 58, 278, 542.

dicitur 'qui credit in me, flumina de ventre eius fluent aque vive,' Joh. 7[:38], aqua enim 'quam ipse dabit ei, fiet in eo fons aque salientis in vitam eternam.' Joh. 4[:14], quam etc."

ff. 52ra-53rb, incomplete question of Thomas Wylton: "An <animam> intellectivam esse formam corporis humani possit ratione necessaria probari et convinci evidenter."[22]

ff. 53v-54r: blank

ff. 54va-56vb: Petrus Aureoli, *Sent*. I, dist. 33: "Circa secundum vero considerandum quod aliqui dicere voluerunt quod proprietas et essentia sunt quid secundum rem. . . ."

Quire 7 (ff. 57r-66v)

ff. 57ra-58ra [Henricus de Friemar junior?], "Recollectiones super secundum Sententiarum"[23]

57ra: "Utrum ex ordine entium in ultimum finem possit concludi productio eorum a deo."

57rb: "Utrum repugnat creature habuisse isto modo esse a deo ab eterno."

57rb: "Utrum creatio esset possibilis, si non differret realiter esse ab essentia."

57va: "Utrum creature possit communicari virtus creandi."

57va: "Utrum creatio et conservatio differant realiter."

57vb: "Utrum tempus habeat complementum ab anima."

57vb: "Utrum maneat idem nunc in toto tempore."

ff. 58ra-59rb: *Questiones*[24]

---

[22] Also in Pelplin, Seminarium Duchownego 53 (102), ff. 217vb-223rb, edited by W. Senko, "Quaestio Disputata de anima intellectiva," *Studia Mediewistyczne*, 5 (1964), 75-116. See also Senko, "La quaestio disputata de anima intellectiva de Thomas Wylton dans le ms. 53/102 de la Bibliothèque du grand séminaire de Pelplin," in *Die Metaphysik im Mittelalter*, ed. A. Zimmermann, Miscellanea Mediaevalia 2 (1963), pp. 464-471.

[23] Listed in Stegmüller, *Repertorium*, nr. 1197, as anonymous. Pelster, "Zur Überlieferung," 400, recognized that these questions were by an Augustinian friar, since the author refers to Giles of Rome as "doctor noster". Nielsen, "The Intelligibility of Faith," 28, discovered that one of the opinions expressed by the author against Auriol is attributed by Auriol to a "Henricus". This makes it likely that these questions belong to Henricus de Alemania junior, also referred to in the secondary literature as Henricus de Vrimaria [Friemar] junior. This is an important discovery, since until now the only portions of Henry's commentary we had are his *Additiones in libros Sententiarum*, printed along with Giles of Rome's commentary in the Basel edition of 1497, and numerous manuscripts of Henry's commentary on book IV of the *Sentences*.

[24] Pelster, "Zur Überlieferung," 400, initially placed these questions with the following group, but in his "Kleine Beiträge," 251, he described those on 58r-60r (actually 58r-59r) as Giles of Rome, *De compositione angelorum*. Coxe, *Catalogus*, p. 17, had already described them as being

58ra: "Modus ymaginandi eternitatem motus, secundum quod eam posuerunt Philosophus et Commentator et alii peripatetici."
58va: "Utrum angelus sit compositus ex materia et forma."
58va: "Utrum in angelis sit compositio ex genere et differentia."
58vb: "Utrum in angelis sit individuatio."
59ra: "Utrum quicunque duo angeli differant specie."
59ra: "Utrum demon in eius initio fuerit malus."

ff. 59rb-59vb: *Principium in Sententias*, including a sermon (59rb-59vb) based on Esth. 8:4: Sceptrum aureum protendit manu…, followed by two short comments (59vb) on the same text, the first of which begins: "Quia sicut patuit in precedenti principio primi libri…."

ff. 60ra-66rb: Gerardus [de Siena], *Questiones in primo libro Sententiarum*:[25]

ff. 60ra-60rb: "Utrum deus sub absoluta ratione deitatis sit subiectum in theologia, ubi est primo videndum: Utrum sub illa ratione sit infinitus." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, Prologue, quest. 2, art. 3: "Utrum deus sub absoluta ratione deitatis sit infinitus, et utrum sub tali ratione sit subiectum in theologia." [Rome, Bibl. Angelica 338, 10ra; Chicago, Univ. Lib. 22, 6vb]. For the comparison of texts, see below, note 30.

ff. 60rb-60vb: "Utrum veritas quam scimus de deo per theologiam contineatur sub obiecto adequato nostri intellectus." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, Prolog., quest. 2, art. 4: "Utrum veritas quam scimus de deo per theologiam contineatur sub obiecto nostri intellectus." [Angelica 338, 12rb; Chicago 22, 8ra]

f. 60vb: "Utrum articuli fidei sint principia in theologia." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, Prolog., quest. 3, art. 1: "Utrum articuli fidei sint principia istius scientie." [Angelica 338, 13vb; Chicago 22, 9ra] For the comparison of texts, see below, appendices I and II.

f. 61ra: "Utrum hec scientia subalternetur scientie dei et beatorum." Gerard, *Sent*. I, Prolog., quest. 3, art. 2: "Utrum certitudo veritatis in ista scientia

---

Giles of Rome, *Quaestiones de angelis*, and they were discussed by Gerardo Bruni, "Di alcune opere inedite e dubbie di Egidio Romano," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 7 (1935), 174-196, at 177, and Bruni, *Le opere di Egidio Romano* (Firenze, 1936), pp. 125-126.

25) Pelster, "Zur Überlieferung," 400, identified these questions as belonging to a commentary on the first book of the *Sentences*, but in his subsequent article, "Zur ersten Polemik," 31, although he surmised the author was an Augustinian Hermit, he mistakenly called it a commentary on the second book of the *Sentences*. Clark correctly identified them as belonging to Gerard of Siena. In referring to the parallel questions in Gerard, I have followed the structure used in all manuscripts of Gerard (questions divided into subquestions called articles), not the form used by Clark (articles divided into questions).

dependeat a superiori scientia sicut a subalternante." [Angelica 338, 14vb; Chicago 22, 9vb]

ff. 61ra-61rb: "Utrum certitudo veritatis in ista scientia addat aliquid supra certitudinem fidei ratione cuius additi faciat adhesionem fidei firmiorem." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, Prolog., quest. 3, art. 3: "Utrum certitudo veritatis in ista scientia addat aliquid super certitudinem fidei ratione cuius certitudinis faciat adhesionem fidei firmiorem." [Angelica 338, 16ra; Chicago 22, 10vb]

ff. 61rb-61va: "Utrum theologia possit dici scientia." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, Prolog., quest. 3, art. 4: Utrum ista scientia habeat tantam certitudinem quantam habent alie scientie humanitus adinvente. [Angelica 338, 17va; Chicago 22, 11vb] Cf. a similar but not identical question below, ff. 67r-67v.

ff. 61va-61vb: "Utrum fides et scientia proprie dicta compaciantur se in eodem et respectu eiusdem." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, Prologue, quest. 4, art. 1: "Utrum cognitio veritatis theologice compaciatur se cum enigma fidei et evidentiam scientie." [Angelica 338, 19ra; Chicago 22, 12va] Cf. a similar question below, ff. 71v-72r.

ff. 61vb-62va: "Utrum deus possit dare viatori scientiam abstractivam de veritate sue essentie, que simul staret cum fide, ita quod non traheret viatorem extra statum vie." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, Prolog., quest. 4, art. 3: "Utrum deus possit dare viatori scientiam abstractivam de veritate sue essentie que simul staret cum fide, ita quod non traheret viatorem extra statum vie." [Angelica 338, 21vb; Chicago 22, 14rb]

ff. 62va-62vb: "Utrum distinctio speculativi a practico sumatur ex obiecto." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, Prologue, quest. 5, art. 1: "Utrum distinctio speculativi a practico sumatur ab obiecto." [Angelica 338, 25rb; Chicago 22, 16rb]

ff. 62vb-63ra: "Utrum dilectio dei debeat reduci ad speculationem vel ad praxim, vel sit collocando in quodam tertio genere." Cf. Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, Prologue, quest. 5, art. 6: "Utrum talis dilectio debeat reduci ad speculationem vel ad praxim, vel sit collocando in quodam tertio genere distinctum ab ipsis, et per consequens utrum sit denominanda dilectiva sive affectiva." [Angelica 338, 33ra; Chicago 22, 21ra]

ff. 63ra-63rb: "Utrum obiectum beatificum habeat plures rationes fruibiles, ita quod voluntas possit frui eo secundum unam earum non fruendo secundum aliam." Cf. Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, dist. 1, quest. 2, art. 3: "Utrum summum bonum habeat plures rationes fruibiles." [Angelica 338, 38va; Chicago 22, 24vb]

f. 63rb: "Utrum distinctio actuum sit a potentiis vel ab obiectis." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, dist. 1, quest. 3, art. 2: "Utrum distinctio actuum sit a potentiis vel ab obiectis." [Angelica 338, 41vb; Chicago 22, 26vb]

ff. 63rb-63va: "Utrum obiectum fruitionis obiciat se voluntati ad fruendum et intellectui ad videndum sub eadem ratione." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, dist. 1, quest. 3, art. 3: "Utrum obiectum fruitionis obiciat se voluntati ad fruendum et intellectui ad videndum sub eadem ratione." [Angelica 338, 42va; Chicago 22, 27rb]

ff. 63va-64ra: "Utrum pluralitas perfectionum attributalium sint <*sic*> in deo realiter circumscripta omni operatione intellectus." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, dist. 2, quest. 2, art. 2: "Utrum pluralitas istarum perfectionum sit in deo realiter circumscripta omni operatione intellectus." [Angelica 338, 53ra; Chicago 22, 34va]

ff. 64ra-64va: "Supposito quod inter attributa sit sola distinctio rationis, queritur: Utrum ista distinctio sit sumpta ab intra vel ab extra." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, dist. 2, quest. 2, art. 3: "Utrum ista distinctio attributorum secundum rationem sit concepta et sumpta ab intra vel ab extra." [Angelica 338, 56rb; Chicago 22, 37rb]

ff. 64va-65rb: "Utrum ratio entis dicta de deo et creaturis sit una ratio communis." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, dist. 3, quest. 1, art. 1: "Utrum ratio entis dicta de deo et creaturis sit una comunis ratio." [Angelica 338, 62ra; Chicago 22, 41va]

ff. 65rb-65va: "Utrum cognoscamus de deo in via quid est." Gerard, *Sent*. I, dist. 3, quest. 2, art. 2: "Utrum de deo in via cognoscamus quid est." [Angelica 338, 57rb; Chicago 22, 45va]

f. 65va: "Utrum deum esse possit demonstrari." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, dist. 3, quest. 2, art. 4: "Utrum deum esse possit demonstrari." [Angelica 338, 69rb; Chicago 22, 47ra]

ff. 65va-65vb: "Utrum primum cognitum ab intellectu nostro sit aliquod universale." Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. I, dist. 3, quest. 3, art. 4: "Utrum primum cognitum ab intellectu nostro sit aliquod universale." [Angelica 338, 72va; Chicago 22, 49rb]

ff. 65vb-66rb: "Utrum sola persona filii sine aliis personis potuerit incarnari." This probably belongs to Gerard of Siena, *Sent*. III; see below, 87v

f. 66v: blank

Quires 8-9 (67r-78v; 79r-85v):

ff. 67r-85v [Stegmüller 1199]: anonymous comm. on *Sent*. I. This is a separate section, composed of two quires and written in a single-column

format. Although that format differs from the other folios in the manuscript, the scribal hand is similar if not identical with that of the previous folios.[26] The author cites Thomas (69r, 72v, 73r, 82v, 84r [doctor communis]), Henry of Ghent as 'Gand' (69r, 71r, 73r, 79v, 80v, 81r, 82r), Godfredus (72v),[27] Egidius (70r, 73r, 79v, 81r, 82v), Ware (69r, 82r), Scotus in margin and 'Scotus', 'Duns', or 'ille doctor' in text (68r, 70v, 71r, 73r, 73v, 79v, 80r, 81r, 82r), Elpedius [Alexander of San Elpidio OESA] (73r, 82v), Couton [Robert Cowton] (67v, 82r), Aureolus in margin, 'quidam modernus' in text (69r, 69v), Gerardus (67v, 70v, 71r, 81r), Bernardus (69r, 72v),[28] Pulton (75r),[29] Houtton (81r, 81v),[30] and "contra formalitates" (79v). He also cites Augustine, Aristotle, and the Commentator Averroes frequently, and occasionally Avicenna (82r, 84r), Anselm (77v, 82r), Rabimosses [Maimonides] (78r), Richardus [Richard of St. Victor?] (79r), and Lincolnien. [Robert Grosseteste] (82v). Unfortunately the outside margins have been trimmed, resulting in the loss of

---

26) It is often stated that the manuscript is composed of several different scribal hands, which in general is true. But the different format of ff. 67r-85v (single-column as opposed to double-column) has perhaps led to the assumption that the scribal hand also differs from those in the earlier part of the manuscript. Among distinctive characteristics favoring identity are a second form of a 'd' at the beginning of a word, whose top stroke slants forward to the next letter, giving it an appearance similar to the English cursive 's'; a curved pendant stroke on the bottom of the 'r' following a rounded letter, such as 'o', 'p', or 'q'; and a slanted line used to dot 'i's, which, on a final 'i', can make it look like a gothic 's'.

27) Some positions initially attributed to Godfredus (79v, 81r) are struck through and attributed to Egidius.

28) On 72v, opposite 'Ber.' in the margin, the text reads: "Bernardus contra H[enricum?]". Pelster conjectured this might be Bernardus Lombardi O.P., who read the *Sentences* at Paris in 1327-1328, but Bernardus Oliverii O.E.S.A., who read at Paris between 1310 and 1318, might be a better candidate.

29) Possibly John de Polton, sometimes spelled Pulton, an Augustinian friar at the Oxford convent at various times between 1319 and 1347; see A. B. Emden, *Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, vol. III (Oxford, 1957), p. 1493. His name appears in the margin opposite the author's discussion of a passage from book two of Aristotle's *Physics*. No one is being cited at that point other than Aristotle, but Pulton may be the author's source for his argument.

30) Possibly Thomas de Hothom, sometimes spelled Hotton, a fellow of Merton College in 1306, DTh by 1326, and chancellor of Oxford, 1327-1328; see Emden, *Biographical Register*, vol. II, p. 970. One or more of his questions survive in Paris, Bibl. Nat., lat. 15.805, f. 53r; see K. Tachau, "Richard Campsall as a Theologian: New Evidence," in *Historia Philosophiae Medii Aevi. Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, ed. B. Mojsisch and O. Pluta, 2 vols. (Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 1991), II, pp. 979-1002, at 983-985. The portion of this question in Balliol 63 concerned with Houtton has been transcribed at length by Clark, "Authorship," 98-105.

some of the marginalia. These questions were ascribed to an English Augustinian friar by Pelster[31] on the grounds of citing Giles frequently, defining theology as affective, citing Scotus as Duns, and citing Ware and Cowton, presumably thinking that they were only at Oxford, which may not be the case. Ware and Cowton were cited at Paris by Prosper de Reggio Emilia and others before 1314, and it is possible that Pulton and Houtton, like Alnwick, Wylton, and Burley, may have taken part of their studies at Paris. On balance, however, the combined evidence places the commentary at Oxford rather than Paris.

Because marginal citations to "Ger." correspond to first-person statements in the text, e.g. "dico quod" and "Nunc ponam" (67v), "solutio propria" in margin and "Dico igitur aliter" in the text (70v), "ideo dico concedendo" (71r), and "dico quod per distinctionem rationis" (81r), Clark suggested the author of these questions was named 'Gerardus'.[32] While possible, such a marginal identification of the author would be unusual. Even if we assume the scribe is not the author, it is more likely that the marginal name identifies a source for the author rather than himself. Chronologically Gerard of Bergamo, O.E.S.A., would work, but that would almost certainly require a Parisian context and place Pulton and Houtton at Paris.

ff. 67r-67v: "Utrum theologia sit proprie scientia. Quod non, quia est proprie sapientia." <Cf. above, ff. 61rb-va>

ff. 67v-69v: "Utrum theologia sit scientia speculativa vel practica. Quod non speculativa, quia habet obiectum attingibile. . . ."

ff. 69v-70r: "Utrum theologia viatoris subalternetur theologie beatorum." <Cf. above, f. 61ra>

ff. 70r-71v: "Utrum per donum supernaturale possit homo attingere ad cognoscendam aliquam veritatem ad quam attingere non potest per dona naturalia."

ff. 71v-72r: "Utrum fides et scientia proprie dicta possint simul stare." <Cf. above, ff. 61va-vb>

---

31) Pelster, "Zur ersten Polemik gegen Aureoli," 30.

32) Clark, "Authorship," 107-108: "Bearing in mind that the questions in Article 14 [i.e., 67r-85v] are not identical with those in Article 13 [i.e., 60r-66v], and that none in Article 14 match those to be found in the Chigi ms. of Gerardus de Senis' work on the first book of the *Sentences*, it would seem that we have a new, unidentified 'Gerardus'. 'Gerardus' is not commonly an English name, and we might look in the first instance for a location at Paris for him, rather than at Oxford (or Cambridge). Houtton might then be an English Augustinian who studied at Paris. But we are here in *terra incognita*."

ff. 72r-73r: "Circa distinctionem primam primo querendum est de frui, et hoc primo de frui in se, et erit questio ista: Utrum frui sit actus voluntatis vel sit intellectus. Secundo, de frui in ordine ad eius obiectum, et sunt due questiones. Prima: An in obiecto fruibili sint distincte rationes fruibilitatis. Secunda: An obiectum fruibile se obiciat intellectui et voluntati sub eadem ratione. Et tertio queram de frui in ordine ad potentiam, et est questio ista, scilicet: An voluntas de necessitate velit ultimum finem. Et quarto queram de frui in ordine ad delectationem: An sint distincti actus vel non. Et sic sunt .5. questiones. Prima igitur est: Utrum frui sit formaliter actus voluntatis vel intellectus."

ff. 73r-74r: "Secundo queritur: An in obiecto fruibili sint distincte rationes fruibilitatis."

ff. 74r-74v: "Utrum obiectum fruitionis sub eadem ratione se obiciat intellectui et voluntati."

ff. 74v-76r: "Modo quero de frui in ordine ad potentiam, et primo: An voluntas de necessitate velit ultimum finem."

ff. 76r-76v: [*in margin*: 5 questio]: "Modo quero de frui in comparatione ad delectationem: Utrum scilicet dilectio et delectatio sint actus realiter distincti."

ff. 76v-77r: "Circa distinctionem secundam queritur primo de unitate obiecti fruibilis; secundo de eiusdem trinitate. Circa primum quero .3. questiones. Prima: Utrum in universitate entium sit dare aliquid simpliciter primum. Secunda: Utrum primum ens simpliciter sit infinitum. Et tertia: Utrum primum sit tantum unum. De prima questione arguitur quod non. . . ."

ff. 77r-77v: "Utrum primum ens simpliciter sit infinitum."

ff. 77v-78r: "Utrum sit tantum unum primum."

ff. 78r-78v: "Circa secundam partem secunde distinctionis, scilicet de trinitate personarum, quero duo. Primo: Utrum in deo sit aliqua productio realiter ad intra. Secundo: Utrum sit ibi tantum una vel plures."

ff. 78v-79v: "Utrum in divinis sint plures productis realiter ad intra."

ff. 79v-82r: "Quesito de pluralitate emanationum divinarum, quero de distinctione et pluralitate rationum attributis: Utrum, scilicet, attributa in deo sint distincta."

ff. 82r-83r: "Circa distinctionem tertiam queritur: Utrum anima sit idem realiter quod sue potentie."

ff. 83v-84v: "Utrum memoria sit ponenda in parte intellectiva proprie."

ff. 84v-85v: "Utrum relatio sit alia res a fundamento." (incomplete)

Quire 10 (86r-88v):

ff. 86ra-87rb: Petrus Aureoli, *Questiones quodlibetales*

ff. 86ra-va: "Utrum videns deum videat omnia, que in ipso representantur." (Auriol, *Quodl.*, q. 10)

ff. 86va-87rb: "Utrum ad visionem beatificam sit necessarium aliquod lumen supernaturale ultra lumen intellectus agentis." (Auriol, *Quodl.*, q. 9)

ff. 87rb-87va: *Questiones*

ff. 87rb-87va: "Utrum gratia et caritas necessario requirantur ad actum meritorium tamquam duo distincti habitus."

ff. 87va-87va: "Utrum intellectus se habeat active in formatione verbi."

ff. 87va-88ra: Gerardus [of Siena?], *Sent*. III: "Questio Gerardi in principio tertii."

ff. 87va-87vb: "Utrum una persona possit incarnari absque hoc quod alia incarnetur." Cf. last question of the previous Gerard section, ff. 65v-66r

f. 87vb: "Utrum fuit necesse Christum pati pro redemptione generis humani."

ff. 88ra [Gerard of Siena?], *Sent*. IV:

f. 88ra: "Utrum corpus Christi possit esse sub sacramento altaris sine sui mutatione."

f. 88ra: "Utrum anima beata appetat reuniri corpori."

f. 88rb: blank

ff. 88va-88vb: anonymous *Principium Sententiarum* [principial sermon; not a question]: "Ecce 4 quadrige egredientes de medio duorum montium. Zacis 6 [Zach. 6:1]."

Quire 11 (89r-99v): Robertus Beverley, O.F.M.[33]

"Utrum deus sit trinus et unus."

"Utrum a quacumque creatura rationali solus deus sit propter se finaliter diligendus." (incomplete)

One or more quires lost, according to Mynors.

Quire 12 (100r-111v): Gerardus de Bononia [Bologna], O.Carm., *Quodlibet* II, qq. 1-7.[34]

---

[33] Beverley was regent master at Oxford c. 1305. This and the following quires are in a different scribal hand and contain texts from Oxford and Paris belonging to the first decade of the fourteenth century. To that extent they constitute a separate manuscript.

[34] On fol. 100r, in bottom margin, according to Mynors: "Quaterni 5 fratris Willelmi de Woodford iunioris, prec. 2 sol.," which he understood to refer to ownership, but which Palémon Glorieux, *La Littérature Quodlibétique*, vol. II (Paris, 1935), pp. 127-28, who transcribed the

f. 100r: "Utrum possit videri divina essentia ita quod non videatur persona."
f. 101r: "Utrum deus possit facere multitudinem infinitam."
f. 103r: "Utrum deus posset facere subiectum existere sine proprie substantie partem."
f. 107r: "Utrum de essentia eius quod est principium elicitum actus sit inherere."
f. 108r: "Utrum in suprema intelligentia sit aliquid positivum per quod differt a causa prima."
f. 109v: "Utrum angelus ex hoc quod cognoscat alium a se intuitive, datur quod alius existat."
f. 111r: "Utrum in Christo sint due filiationes reales." (incomplete)

The remainder of the manuscript (ff. 112ra-169vb) contains quodlibetal questions, most of them belonging to Robert of Winchelsey, DTh and chancellor at Oxford, and date to the late thirteenth century, before Winchelsey's ecclesiastical career that led to the archbishopric of Canterbury. For a description of this portion of Balliol 63, see Mynors, *Catalogue*, pp. 48-49.

In the foregoing analysis two groups of questions, long considered anonymous, have now been identified or confirmed from other manuscripts. Those on ff. 60r-66r and probably those on ff. 87va-88ra belong to Gerard of Siena, O.E.S.A., as Clark also maintained. This last group of questions on books III and IV of the *Sentences* are particularly important, since they are unique to this manuscript, and Gerard only edited for circulation his questions on book I and the first third of those on book II. The question in Amiens 234 with a title similar to Gerard's question on whether God is the subject of theology "sub absoluta ratione deitatis" is a different question and not by Gerard. It

---

note as "Responsio Villielmi de Wodeford junioris," understood to refer to authorship, without noting that he had attributed the same group of questions in *La Littérature Quodlibétique*, vol. I (Kain, 1925), pp. 129-30, to Gerard of Bologna. Although Mynors declined to identify this William Woodford with the late fourteenth-century Franciscan opponent of John Wyclif on the grounds that the other contents of the manuscript as well as the scribal hand belong to the early fourteenth century, the Woodford in question may well be the Franciscan because the note refers to the purchase of five quires, not the cost of copying, and the scribal hand of the note could date to the third quarter of the fourteenth century. Glorieux and Mynors transcribed the minums in the word after 'Woodford' as 'iunioris', but the note might better be transcribed as "Quaterni 5 fratris Willelmi de Woodford minoris, prec. 2 sol." It has since been confirmed that these questions belong to Gerard of Bologna. For a recent discussion, see C. Schabel, "Carmelite *Quodlibeta*," in *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages: The Fourteenth Century*, pp. 493-543, at 505-514.

merits study and was probably written in the years immediately before or after 1300.[35] The questions on ff. 57ra-58ra that Lauge Nielsen was able to identify as belonging to a 'Henricus' almost certainly belong to Henricus de Vrimaria [Friemar] junior, O.E.S.A. and represent an important addition to his known work.

A comparison of the questions of Gerard of Siena and the question of Dionysius of Burgo with the version edited for circulation by those two authors permits a more definitive answer to the question raised by Michalski and Nielsen, namely whether questions in the first half of Balliol 63 are early, pre-edited versions of those texts or later abbreviations. For Gerard and Dionysius they are pre-edited versions, confirming what Nielsen suspected was the case for the questions of Auriol and Wylton. In all cases the questions are shorter in the Balliol 63 version, sometimes following the same structure as the expanded, edited version, and sometimes rearranged. Dionysius' question has the same structure in both versions, although more briefly expressed in Balliol 63.[36] The same is true with the first question of Gerard in Balliol 63.[37]

---

35) For details, see Courtenay, "Gerard of St. Victor and Amiens 234".

36) Dionysius de Burgo, *In primum Sententiarum*, q. 1 (Balliol 63, f. 24ra): "Utrum finis per se sacre scripture in via sit amare deum. Et arguitur quod non, quia in scientia theologie est deus subiectum sub absoluta ratione; igitur dilectio dei non est finis eius. Antecedens probatur, quia si non, sequitur quod viatori esset possible haberi aliqua theologia prior ista, que esset de deo sub ratione absoluta, que est prior quam ratio contracta. Hoc est inconveniens; igitur relinquitur quod deus, etc. Consequentia probatur, quia nulla scientia habet per se finem amare nisi ostendat subiectum sub ratione amabilis, quia ratio pure amabilis est ratio boni; ratio vero boni non est ratio absoluta sed contracta; igitur consequentia bona. Igitur sequitur conclusio." Erfurt, CA 2° 131, f. 2rb: "Utrum finis per se sacre scripture in via sit amare deum. Et arguitur quod non, quia in scientia theologie est deus subiectum sub ratione absoluta; igitur dilectio dei non est finis eius. Antecedens probatur, quia si deus sub ratione absoluta non esset in theologia vie subiectum, sequeretur quod viatori esset possible haberi alia theologia prior ista, que esset de deo sub ratione absoluta, que est ratio prior quam sit ratio contracta. Hoc est inconveniens; igitur relinquitur quod eius subiectum sit deus sub absoluta ratione. Consequentia probatur, quia nulla scientia habet per se finem amare nisi ostendat obiectum sub ratione amabilis; sed ratio absoluta, puta ratio deitatis, non includit rationem amabilis, quia ratio pure amabilis est ratio boni, ratio vero boni non est ratio deitatis vel ratio absoluta, sed contracta; ergo consequentia vera et consequens conclusio."

37) Gerard of Siena, Prol., q. 2, a. 3, in Balliol 63, f. 60ra: "Utrum deus sub absoluta ratione deitatis sit subiectum in theologia, ubi est primo videndum: utrum [deus] sub illa ratione sit infinitus. Hic volunt quidam quod non, sed infinitas est solum annexa rationi deitatis. Contrarium tamen huius vult frater Egidius, immo secundum eum magis explicatur ratio infinitatis nomine deitatis quam nomine infinitatis, quapropter si infinitas in suo intellectu includit infinitatem, multo magis et deitas tam includet." And in Rome, Angelica 338, f. 10ra: "Utrum deus sub absoluta ratione deitatis sit infinitus, et utrum sub tali ratione sit subiectum in theologia.

In other questions, however, for example Gerard, Prol. q. 3, a. 1, which is edited in the two versions in appendices to this article, early and later arguments in Balliol 63 appear in reverse order in manuscripts of Gerard's edited question.

In the Balliol 63 version, Gerard began (Appendix I, lines 3-10) with Aristotle's discussion of scientific reasoning in the first book of his *Posterior Analytics* based on three different types of evidence: axiomatic (*dignitates*), hypotheses or premises derived from those principles (*suppositiones*), and assumptions or opinions (*petitiones*). Against that background he set forth his own position that the principles in theology *in via* are sometimes axioms and sometimes truths derived from those axioms, but never opinions or illegitimate postulates, using a passage from Grosseteste's commentary on the *Posterior Analytics* (Appendix I, lines 13-16) in support of his argument. A statement from Augustine, whose textual location is not identified (Appendix I, lines 29-31), is also used as one of his supporting authorities. Subsequently the scribe or collector (perhaps one and the same) inserts a note into Gerard's text expressing a different view (Appendix I, lines 36-37), and directs the reader to Wylton's question in the same manuscript on whether theology is practical or speculative (Balliol 63, ff. 19va-19vb).

In the version of this question that was edited for circulation, Gerard begins with Auriol's position that the articles of faith are not the principles of theology (Appendix II, lines 2-23). The passage from Augustine, which in the Balliol 63 version was used as evidence for Gerard's own position, is now placed within Auriol's argument, from which Gerard probably took it, and is specifically identified as coming from *De Trinitate*, book IV [actually XIV], chapter 1 (Appendix II, 19-23). Gerard then presents arguments against Auriol's position (Appendix II, lines 24-59) before turning to his own position (Appendix II, lines 60-163). It is in this last section that he introduces and expands on Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* (Appendix II, lines 63-75) and incorporates the passage from Grosseteste (Appendix II, lines 79-82).

The edited version of this question is almost three times as long as the version in Balliol 63. It is better structured and more effectively argued. And the rearrangement of the elements is particularly telling. It reveals, I think, that in

---

Quantum ad istum articulum videntur velle quidam [*margin*: Henricus, Quodlibet 12, quest. prima] quod ratio deitatis absolute sumpta non includit in suo intellectu infinitatem, immo secundum eos infinitas est quedam ratio sibi annexa. Contrarium tamen vult frater Egidius, immo secundum eum magis explicatur infinitas nomine deitatis quam nomine infinitatis, quapropter si infinitas includit in suo intellectu rationem infiniti, multo magis ipsa deitas. Et quia dicta conclusio apparet mihi rationalis et bona,. . . ."

the Balliol version we are looking at a pre-edited version. It is implausible that someone abbreviating a question after its initial circulation would alter the structure so radically. On the other hand, it is not uncommon for authors to restructure and expand their arguments in a revised redaction of a question. What we have in the questions of Gerard of Siena that were selected for inclusion in Balliol 63 is a record of their oral version, copied by someone who attended his lectures, no doubt leaving out phrases in the rush to capture the basic arguments and conclusions. These questions are not the work of an official *reportator*, who would have produced a fuller and cleaner text to be reviewed and revised by the author, and who would have been commissioned to copy all the questions, not simply a selected group. Yet, for that very reason, the questions in Balliol 63 take us much closer to the oral version of a lecture or disputation than the version edited for circulation, and perhaps even than an official *reportatio* might have. And what is true of the questions of Gerard in Balliol 63 is probably true of those from Wylton and Auriol in the same manuscript, as Nielsen suspected. Roth noted a similar difference between the version of John of Bologna's *Questiones de anima* in Balliol 63 and the form circulated in other manuscripts.[38]

In all probability this first half of Balliol 63 is a work similar to Vat. lat. 1086, Prosper de Reggio Emilia's "notebook" in which texts and questions that interested the collector and copied at the time of their oral presentation were assembled together, along with the first part of what may be the *Sentences* commentary of the collector.[39] The collector was especially interested in questions concerned with the nature of theology and related issues that were traditionally treated at the beginning of a *Sentences* commentary. As has been suggested, most of the texts in the first ten quires of Balliol 63 are the work one scribe. It is possible that this scribe of this portion of the manuscript was also the collector, although he may not in all cases have been the person who attended and reported on the lectures or disputations. The scribe inserted into the question edited in Appendix I a cross-reference to a question of Wylton also included in Balliol 63.[40] The scribe was certainly English but was copying his quires at Paris, which is where the lectures and disputations took place. Moreover, the collector, whether identical with the scribe or not, was probably

38) Roth, *English Austin Friars*, p. 598.

39) On Vat. lat. 1086, see W. J. Courtenay, "Reflections on Vat. lat. 1086 and Prosper of Reggio Emilia, O.E.S.A.," in *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages. The Fourteenth Century*, pp. 345-57.

40) See Appendix I, lines 43-44. This attests to the unity of the groups of questions in the first half of Balliol 63, at least in the double-column portions, which form a reasoned collection.

an Augustinian friar. Apart from Wylton and Auriol, the texts collected here are by Augustinian authors, as is the *Sentences* commentary on ff. 67r-85v.

The most obvious context in which an Augustinian friar from England would be at Paris in this period would have been in the lectorate program, although one cannot rule out the possibility of the presence of a more advanced English theological student at the Paris convent.[41] Students sent to Paris for the lectorate program by their province were not beginners. They had already had their basic theological training and were completing their preparation to become lectors in the convents and *studia* of their province. While abroad it was not uncommon to collect current or important scholastic texts and bring them back to a convent or *studium* in one's own province.[42] Before incepting in theology at Paris Prosper of Reggio reported or summarized questions, which he took to Italy when he returned there in 1318.[43] The Italian Franciscan, Nicholas Comparini of Assisi, recorded lectures and disputations he heard at Norwich and Oxford, and which he or a confrere took back to Assisi in or after 1338.[44] The texts in Balliol 63 were copied at Paris and probably brought to England, where the manuscript circulated for a time before being acquired by William Gray in the fifteenth century.

When were the texts in this first half of Balliol 63 copied and assembled? The disputed questions between Wylton and Auriol took place between 1318 and 1321.[45] Dionysius de Burgo completed his lectures on book I of the *Sentences* in January 1318, and the opening question of his commentary, much of which is included in Balliol 63, would have been given in October 1317.[46]

---

41) On the lectorate program of the Augustinian Order, see E.Ypma, "La promotion au lectorat chez les Augustins et le «De lectorie gradu» d'Ambroise de Cora," *Augustiniana*, 13 (1963), 391-417.

42) A late example is Rome, Bibl. Angelica 101, containing Gerard of Siena's commentary on book I of the *Sentences*, which Ambrose of Cora O.E.S.A. acquired at Paris when he studied there in the lectorate program (f. 239v: "Iste liber est ad usus fratris Ambrosii de Cora, quem emit Parisius dum ibi erat in lectoria.")

43) Courtenay, "Reflections on Vat. lat. 1086".

44) For details, see W. J. Courtenay, "Nicholas of Assisi and Vat. Chigi B V 66," *Scriptorium*, 36 (1982), 260-63.

45) Auriol's *Quodlibet* dates between 1318 and 1320; see Nielsen, "The *Quodlibet* of Peter Auriol," pp. 267-68.

46) The *explicit* to Book I of Dionysius' questions on the *Sentences* in Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibl., CA 2.131, f. 96r, reads: "Explicit lectura primi libri sententiarum edita a fratre Dionysio de Burgo ordinis heremitarum quam finivit Parisius anno domini 1317 die 12 mensis Januarii," which means 1318 according to the modern calendar.

We are less knowledgeable about the dates for John of Lana's career.[47] It is generally assumed he read the *Sentences* at Paris around 1316, and his *Questiones de anima* were composed after that earlier academic exercise, since he was a formed bachelor at the time he wrote this later work.[48] It therefore most likely belongs to the 1318-1321 period. Henry de Alemania, or Vrimaria, junior read the *Sentences* at Paris around 1318-1319 and was one of the early Augustinian critics of Auriol, as the text in Balliol 63 shows.[49] Initially it looked as if the presence of questions by Gerard of Siena might date the first half of Balliol 63 to the late 1320s or later, since it has been assumed by earlier scholars that Gerard read the *Sentences* at Paris around 1326. Work on his manuscripts, however, has uncovered two that specifically date his sentential lectures at Paris to 1319-1321, and he would have completed his lectures on book I of the *Sentences* early in 1320.[50]

The first half of Balliol 63 is a remarkable window into the lecture halls at Paris in a relatively brief moment in time, 1317-1321. To that degree it compliments Vat. lat. 1086, whose compiler, Prosper de Reggio Emilia O.E.S.A., copied disputations at Paris that occurred in 1310-1316, recording them in a pre-publication version and, in most cases, the only version. Since the texts in the first half of Balliol 63 are in a pre-edited, pre-publication form representing an unofficial *reportatio* of the oral event, as comparisons with the edited version show with Auriol, Gerard of Siena, and Dionysius de Burgo, it can be presumed that the other texts probably also represent pre-publication versions and date to this same period. And despite the fact that most of the quires in the manuscript were copied by an English scribe and that the single-column *Sentences* commentary on ff. 67r-85v may have been written and delivered at Oxford, the texts reflect intellectual activity in the faculty of theology at Paris in 1317-1321—a rare example of theological and philosophical thinking and interaction among mendicant and secular scholars at one place and time.

---

47) C. Schabel and W. J. Courtenay, "Augustinian *Quodlibeta* after Giles of Rome," in *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages. The Fourteenth Century*, pp. 545-68, at 556-57.

48) Balliol 63, f. 28ra: "Fratris Johannis de Lana de Bononia, bacellarii in sacra pagina…."

49) Schabel and Courtenay, "Augustinian *Quodlibeta*," pp. 550-52. For the discovery that opinions in Balliol 63, ff. 57r-58r were attributed by Auriol to a 'Henricus', see Nielsen, "The Intelligibility of Faith," 28.

50) Gdansk, Bibl. Akad. Nauk, Mar. F 199, f. 171r: "Explicit lectura primi libri sententiarum edita a fratre Gerrando (!) de Senis sacre pagine baccelario ordinis sancti Augustini anno domini M°CCC°XVIIII," which, if he completed his lectures on book I in January, as was normal, would mean 1320 according to the modern calendar. Vat. lat. 4291, f. 79ra: "Explicit lectura primi libri sententiarum edita a fratre Gerardo de Senis, sacre pagine bacellario, ordinis fratrum heremitarum sancti augustini. Deo gratias. Anno domini millesimo CCC vicesimo primo [1321].

APPENDIX I

Gerard of Siena, In Primum Sententiarum, Prol., q. 3, a. 1
Oxford, Balliol 63, f. 60vb

Utrum articuli fidei sint principia in theologia. Pro quo est sciendum quod hoc est loquendum de principiis non quocumque modo, sed solum de principiis que sunt causa veritatis omnium complexionum in scientia aliqua, et sic loquendo tria inveniuntur genera principiorum, sicut potest haberi Arist., primo *Posteriorum*, nam quedam sunt principia que vocantur dignitates, quedam suppositiones et quedam petitiones. Est autem inter ista hec differentia, nam dignitates sunt que nulla ratione indigent ad sue veritatis evidentiam, que per seipsas nate sunt videri. Suppositio autem proprie vocatur illa que potest demonstrari in aliqua scientia, accipitur tamen ab adiscente sine demonstatione, et supponitur tamquam probabilis. Sed petitio proprie est illa que est contraria opinioni adiscentis, et ideo prius petitur eius concessio, quam ex ipsa procedatur ad aliquid aliud.

Ad propositum dico quod articuli fidei sunt principia theologie aliquo modo sicut dignitates, et aliquo modo sicut suppositiones, nullo modo sicut petitiones. Primum patet, quia ut tactum per Aristotelem patet quod dignitate non indigent etc. Vero dicit Lincolnien. quod "sicut lucidum visibile non eget nisi visu exteriori cadente super ipsum, sic dignitas ad hoc, ut sciatur, non eget nisi ratione, que est aspectus mentis super ipsam cadente." Constat autem quod articuli fidei maxime sunt intelligibiles per se ipsos et maxime evidentes in sua veritate, quantum etiam a parte ipsorum articulorum.

Item, patet secundum quod sic habent similitudinem cum suppositionibus, nam sicut suppositiones non habent evidentiam ex virtute scientie in qua supponuntur sed ex virtute scientie superioris a qua capiuntur, sic et in proposito. Et ad probandum istam conclusionem induco aliud. Primum sic: ille propositiones que formantur de subiecto alicuius scientie, et non possunt <probari> per aliquas a prioris, sunt principia in scientia ista. Sed articuli sunt huiusmodi. Minor patet de se. Maior patet, nam propositiones que formantur de

---

4-6 Aristotle, *Analytica Posteriora*, ed. L. Minio-Paluello (Bruges, 1954) I, c. 10, pp. 295-296; also in *Aristoteles Latinus* IV, ed. L. Minio-Paluello and B. G. Dod (Bruges-Paris, 1968), pp. 24 (translation of James of Venice) and 296 (translation of William of Moerbeka); [Bekker edition, 76b]. 16-18 Robert Grosseteste, *Commentarius in Posteriorum Analyticorum libros*, ed. P. Rossi (Firenze, 1981), p. 158.

subiecto alicuius scientie vel pertinent ad istam scientiam, sicut principia primo considerata, vel sicut conclusiones ex principiis deducte; non potest dici quod articuli pertineant sicut conclusiones, quia suppositum est quod non possunt deduci per priores, nec valet si dicatur quod sufficit eas probari a posteriori, quia si hoc sufficeret, tunc principia cuiuslibet scientie possent dici conclusiones, et conclusiones principia.

Item, hoc patet, quia articuli includunt omnes veritates que pertinent ad scientiam, et excludunt omnes impertinentes, sicut Augustinus, quod non quicquid sciri potest ab homine huic scientie attribuitur, sed illud "tantummodo quo fides saluberrima," etc.

Item, per articulos mensuratur et regulatur tota consideratio theologie; unde non per aliud cogitatur quando aliquis processus in teologia est veridicus quia concordat articulis fidei, et pro oppositum si discordat.

Item, ad articulos stat ultima resolutio totius considerationis theologice, ergo etc.

▪/ Arguunt tamen aliqui quod non possunt ista stare, et vide rationes eorum in questione de practico et speculativo secundum Thomam de Wilton ▪/ Est tamen presens difficultas que tangere ab eis arguunt sic. Illa que in aliqua scientia queruntur, declarantur et probantur non sunt principia, sed principia supponuntur. Sed articuli fidei sunt huiusmodi. Solutio: Querere de principiis dupliciter esse potest. Uno modo ita quod dubitetur de eorum veritate, et ista modo maior est vera et falsa est minor. Alio modo non quod dubetetur de eorum veritate. Sed quod dubitaret de modo apprehendi illam veritatem in speciali que potest bene et male apprehendi. Si enim veritas quorumcunque principiorum in scientia aliqua semper bene apprehenderetur, numquam fieret sillogismus falsigraphus, qui procedit ex principiis male intellectis. Unde quamvis in generali veritas articulorum omnibus catholicis apprehendatur uno modo, nec quantum ad hoc cadat ibi dubitatio vel questio, in speciali tamen posset apprehendi diversis modis, et ideo quantum ad hoc cadunt in dubitationes, et formantur questiones per quam solutionem explanatur veritas articuli in speciali.

Intelligendum tamen quod in toto tali processu ipsemet articulus est principium, nam quamvis in tali processu assumantur quedam alia ad declaratio-

---

35-37 Augustine, *De Trinitate*, XIV, c. 1 (CCh, ser. Lat., 50 A, p. 424; PL 42, col. 1047). 43-44 Thomas Wylton, "Utrum habitus theologicus sit practicus vel speculativus," in Balliol 63, ff. 19va-19vb, edited by Lauge O. Nielsen, "The Debate between Peter Auriol and Thomas Wylton on Theology and Virtue," *Vivarium*, 38 (2000), 35-98, at 76-89.

nem articuli, nihilominus semper supponitur veritas articuli in generali secundum quod est nobis proposita per sacram scripturam tamquam regula et mensura totius processus, cuius signum est, quia quando volumus certificari utrum explicatio facta de articulo in speciali sit vera, statim aspicimus ad veritatem articuli nobis propositam in generalis per sacram scripturam. Et si videmus quod concordet veritati articuli quam sacra scriptura nobis proponit in generali, approbamus explicationem factam tamquam veram; et si discordatur, reprobamus et condempnamus sicut falsum et erroneam. Sicut ergo patet quid dicendum est ad istam questiunculam.

APPENDIX II

Gerard of Siena, In Primum Sententiarum, Prol., q. 3, a. 1
A = Angelica 338, fol. 13vb-14vb, B = Balliol 55, fol. 17vb-19rb,
C = Chicago 22, fol. 9rb-9vb

Quantum ad primum articulum, utrum articuli fidei sint principia theologie, intelligendum quod quidam volunt [**opinio Aureoli**] quod articuli fidei non sint principia istius scientie, quod videntur probare dupliciter. Primo sic: ista que in aliqua scientia queruntur, et postea probantur et concluduntur, non sunt principia illius scientie; sed articuli sunt huiusmodo; ergo. Maior patet in
A, fol. 14ra singulis scientiis, nulla enim scientia querit de suis | principiis, immo ea sup-
B, fol. 18ra ponit, et ex eis procedit ad declarandum et ad concludendum | alia. Minor probatur ex principiis omnium doctorum istius scientie, tam sanctorum quam quoruncumque aliorum, omnes enim procedunt querendo questiones et inducendo dubitationes, que accidunt de ipsis articulis, postea nituntur ad eorum probationem et declarationem quantum eis est possibile. Ita namque facit beatus Augustinus in libro *De Trinitate*, ubi nititur probare articulum trinitatis. Idem facit in libro *Contra Faustum*, ubi nititur probare contra eum duos articulos, scilicet 'Christum esse natum ex Maria Virgine' et 'Spiritum Sanctum fuisse locutum per prophetas'. Istum eundem modum servant doctores moderni in suis scriptis, ex quibus omnibus concluditur quod articuli fidei non sunt principia istius scientie sed conclusiones.

Secundo ad idem sic: nulla scientia ordinatur ad defensionem et roborationem suorum principiorum; sed hec scientia ordinatur ad defensionem articulorum fidei; ergo. Maior patet, quia quelibet scientia utitur suis principiis ad roborandum et defendendum veritates conclusionum. Minor probatur per

2-26 Peter Auriol, *Scriptum super primum Sententiarum*, ed. E.M. Buytaert, vol. I (St. Bonaventure, N.Y., 1953), Prooemium, sect. 1, pp. 139-40. 12 Augustine, *De Trinitate*, I, c. 4 (CCh, ser. Lat., 50, pp. 34-36; PL 42, col. 824). 13-15 Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, III.6-IV.2 (CSEL XXV, 6.1, pp. 267-271; PL 42, cols. 217-220).

1 theologie] fidei AB istius scientie C 2 fidei *om.* C | non *om.* B 3 ista AB illa C 5 scientie *om.* C 7 ad[2] *om.* C 8 istius AB illius C 9 quorumcumque aliorum AC doctorum B 13 Idem AB Item C 15 locutum BC loquntur A 16 quibus AB quo C 20 ergo *om.* C

Augustinum, 4 *De Trinitate*, cap. 1, ubi dicit quod "huic scientie tribuitur id tantummodo quo fides saluberrima nutritur, defenditur, et roboratur." Constat autem quod fides saluberrima est de ipsis articulis relinquitur, ergo quod hec scientia ordinetur ad eorum defensionem, et per consequens non erunt principia ipsius.

[**Contra Aureolum quadruplici ratione**] Iste modus omnino deviat a veritate, et ideo simul arguo contra eum, et probo oppositam conclusionem quadrupliciter. Primo sic: ille propositiones que formantur de subiecto alicuius scientie, et non sunt possibiles probari per aliquas alias a priori, sunt principia in ista scientia; sed articuli fidei sunt quedam propositiones vere formate de subiecto theologie, nec possunt probari per aliquas alias a priori; ergo. Minor est de se nota. Probo maiorem, nam omnes propositiones, que formantur de subiecto alicuius scientie, vel pertinent ad illam scientiam sicut principia primo considerata in illa scientia, vel sicut conclusiones que ex principiis deducuntur. Non potest autem dici quod articuli sint tales propositiones quod pertineant ad istam scientiam sicut conclusiones, quia suppositum est quod non possunt deduci per aliquas alias a priori; nec valet si dicatur quod sufficit eas deduci et probari a posteriori, quia si hoc sufficeret, tunc principia cuiuslibet scientie possent dici conclusiones, et conclusiones etiam principia.

Secundo ad idem sic: illa sunt principia in aliqua scientia que in suo ambitu includunt | omnes veritates que pertinent ad illam scientiam et excludunt B, fol. 18rb
omnes illas que ad eam non pertinent; sed articuli fidei includunt omnes veritates pertinentes ad theologiam et excludunt omnes impertinentes; ergo sunt principia ipsius. Maior patet per inductionem in singulis scientiis. Minorem probo per Augustinum superius in contrarium allegatum, ubi dicit quod "tantummodo huic scientie attribuitur quo fides saluberrima" etc., ex quibus verbis habetur manifeste quod ille veritates, que sunt extranee a fide et ab articulis fidei, non pertinent ad theologiam; ille vero, que possunt reduci ad articulos fidei aliquo modo, omnes pertinent ad considerationem ipsius, ergo etc.

22-23 Augustine, *De Trinitate*, XIV, c. 1 (CCh, ser. Lat., 50 A, p. 424; PL 42, col. 1047). 46-47 Augustine, *De Trinitate*, XIV, c. 1, cited above.

---

22 huic AC huius B | id AB illud C 23 quo AB quod C | et AC ac B 31 ista AB illa C 31-32 sunt… priori *om.* B 32 nec C non AB 33 de AB per C 34 scientie *om.* C 35 primo AB prima C 36 autem *om.* B | articuli sint *om.* B 38 deduci *om.* C | aliquas BC aliquis A 40 conclusiones[2] *om.* C 45 singulis AB omnibus C 46 dicit AB dicitur C 50 aliquo modo AC alioquomodo B

Tertio ad idem sic: illa per que regulatur et mensuratur tota consideratio alicuius scientie sunt principia in illa scientia; sed tota consideratio theologie mensuratur per articulos fidei; ergo. Maior est evidens. Probo minorem, quia
A, fol. 14rb tota consideratio istius scientie et totus processus in ea fundatur | super veritate articulorum tamquam super regula et mensura a qua deviare non licet unum; et tunc cognoscimus aliquem processum in illa scientia esse veridicum quando concordat veritati articulorum; econtra tunc cognoscimus ipsum esse erroneum quando a veritate articulorum discordat. Hec autem omnia veritatem non haberent nisi prefati articuli principia essent in ista scientia.

Quarto ad idem sic: illa ad que stat ultima resolutio totius considerationis theologice sunt principia theologie; articuli fidei sunt huiusmodo; ergo. Maior
C, fol. 9va patet in singulis | scientiis, videmus enim in quacumque scientia quod terminus sue considerationis stat in resolutione ad sua principia, ultra que transire non habet. Minorem probo, quia in theologia non apparet in quo stet terminus sue considerationis per resolutionem nisi articuli fidei; ergo. Relinquitur quod articuli fidei sint principia istius scientie.

[**Quid sibi videtur dicendum**] Ut tamen melius intelligatur per quem modum articuli sunt principia theologie est sciendum quod nos loquimur de principiis non quocumque modo, sed solum de illis que sunt causa veritatis omnium complexionum in aliqua scientia, et loquendo isto modo tria sunt genera principiorum in aliqua scientia, sicut potest haberi a Philosopho, primo *Posteriorum*, nam quedam sunt principia que vocantur dignitates, quedam vero alia vocantur suppositiones, et quedam alia vocantur petitiones, inter que tria dignitates potissime vocantur principia, quia ad ea stat resolutio omnium
B, fol. 18va veritatum, et ipsa | simpliciter sunt causa veritatis in omnibus complexionibus illius scientie, cuius sunt dignitates.

72-73 Aristotle, *Analytica Posteriora*, ed. L. Minio-Paluello (Bruges, 1954) I, c. 10, pp. 295-296; also in *Aristoteles Latinus* IV, ed. L. Minio-Paluello and B.G. Dod (Bruges-Paris, 1968), pp. 24 (translation of James of Venice) and 296 (translation of William of Moerbeka); [Bekker edition, 76b].

---

52 regulatur AC regulantur B | mensuratur AC mensurantur B 55-56 veritate AB veritatem C 57 et *om.* C 57-58 aliquem … cognoscimus *om.* B 57 illa AB ista C 58 veritati AB veritatis C 60 haberent AB habent C 61 resolutio AC consideratio B 63 enim *om.* C 64-66 stat … considerationis *om.* B 66 considerationis AB resolutionis C 68 tamen *om.* C 69 loquimur BC loquimus A 70 solum] *add.* modo C 77 illius AB istius C

Est autem hec differentia inter dignitates et suppositiones, sicut declarat ibidem Aristoteles, quia dignitates non indigent aliqua veritate exterius ad sui veritatis evidentiam, quia per se magis sunt nate videri. Suppositio quippe vocatur ipsa que potest demonstrari in aliqua scientia, accipitur tamen ab addiscente sine demonstratione, et supponitur tamquam probabilis. Petitio autem proprie est illa que est contraria opinioni addiscentis, et ideo prius petitur eius concessio, quam ex ipsa procedatur ad aliquid aliud. Ex quo apparet quomodo differt petitio a dignitate et suppositione.

Ad propositum ergo descendendo dico quod articuli fidei sunt principia aliquo modo sicut dignitates et aliquo modo sicut suppositiones; nullo tamen modo sicut petitiones. Nam quod sint principia sicut dignitates probatur, quia ut tactum est per Aristotelem, dignitates non egent ratione extra demonstrante, ut dicit Lincolniensis, quod "sicut lucidum visibile ut videatur non indiget nisi visu exteriori cadente super ipsum, sic dignitas, ut sciatur, non eget nisi ratione, que est aspectus mentis, simpliciter super ipsa cadente." Ex quibus nobis statim patet quod omne illud quod in genere complexorum est per seipsum intelligibile, ita quod non indiget ratione demonstrante, eoipso habet rationem principii et dignitatis. Constat autem quod articuli fidei maxime sunt intelligibiles per seipsos et maxime evidentes in sua veritate, et quamvis a nobis non intelligantur.

Hoc tamen non obstat quando debeant dici theologie principia, sicut dignitates, propter duo. Primo quia hoc non est ex parte articulorum, sed ex parte nostra. Sicut ergo non obstante quod principia alicuius scientie humanitus adinvente non intelligantur ab isto vel ab illo, nihilominus tamen vere sunt principia illius, quia vere in se sunt intelligibilia et intelliguntur ab illis qui perfecte habent illam scientiam. Ita etiam non obstante quod articuli fidei a nobis non intelliguntur, nihilominus tamen vere sunt principia ipsius

---

79-80 Ibid 89-90 Ibid. 90-92 Robert Grosseteste, *Commentarius in Posteriorum Analyticorum libros*, ed. P. Rossi (Firenze, 1981), p. 158.

---

79 veritate AB veritatis C 81 ipsa A illa BC 81 tamen A cum B 89 extra A ex natura B 91 indiget A eget B 91 dignitas AC dignitates B 92 mentis *om.* B 93 nobis *om.* B 94 intelligibile AB intelligendum C 98 theologie principia A principia theologie B 99 primo quia A quia B | sed A si B sicut C 101 intelligantur B intelligatur A 101 vel AC et B 102 illius] *add.* scientie C | vere *om.* C 102 intelliguntur B intelligunt A 104 intelliguntur B intelligantur A

B, fol. 18vb theologie, quia vere in se sunt intelligibiles | et vere intelliguntur ab eis qui perfecte habent scientiam theologie, sicut sunt beati.

Ulterius apparet hoc secundo ex eo quod ista theologia utitur istis principiis
A, fol. 14va mensurando et regulando | totam suam considerationem, quemadmodum scientie humanitus adinvente utuntur ipsis dignitatibus regulando et mensurando totum suum processum per eas; quapropter non obstante quod prefati articuli non intelligantur a theologo, nihilominus tamen vere sunt principia theologie ratione usus, quia eis utitur tamquam dignitatibus.

Ulterius, dico quod possunt dici principia theologie tamquam suppositiones quia habent aliquam similitudinem cum suppositionibus. Nam sicut suppositiones non habent evidentiam ex virtute scientie in qua supponuntur sed ex virtute scientie superioris a qua accipiuntur, ita articuli fidei non habent evidentiam ex virtute theologie nostre in qua supponuntur sed ex virtute theologie superioris, scilicet Dei et beatorum, a qua accipiuntur. Et hinc est quod quamvis theologia nostra non sit subalternata theologie Dei et beatorum proprie loquendo, est tamen ibi aliqua similitudo subalternationis, sicut patebit in sequenti articulo.

Concludo ergo quod articuli fidei sint principia theologie et sicut dignitates et sicut suppositiones, nullo tamen modo sicut petitiones. Nam sicut tangebatur superius, petitio est contraria opinioni addiscentis, et ideo petitur eius concessio. Articuli autem fidei non sunt contrarii addiscenti theologiam, immo si essent contrarii ei, nullo modo posset discere theologiam, quapropter debent supponi, sicut per se nota.

Motiva autem superius inducta in contrarium non cogunt, nam cum primo dicitur quod nulla scientia querit de suis principiis sed supponit et ex eis procedit ad concludendum alia, dico quod querere de principiis potest intelligi dupliciter. Primo ut dubitetur de eorum veritate, et illo modo nulla scientia querit de suis principiis, quia quelibit scientia supponit ea esse verissima, nec etiam isto modo theologia querit de suis principiis, scilicet de articuli fidei, quia supponit eos habere infallibilem veritatem.

---

105 intelligibiles AB intelligibilia C | intelliguntur BC intelligunt A 107 hoc BC huius A 108 suam AB scientiam et C 111 intelligantur AC intelliguntur B 113 quod AB quia C 115 evidentiam AB evidentias C | sed AC si B 116 non AC si B 118 theologie superioris, scilicet Dei et beatorum, a qua accipiuntur AC theologie accipiuntur superioris a qua accipitur B 124 contraria B econtraria A 126 ei *om.* BC | discere AB adiscere C 127 nota B noti AC 128 superius AC superioris B 131 illo A isto BC 132 nec AC ut B

Secundo modo potest intelligi quod fiat questio de principiis, | non quod B, fol. 19ra
dubitetur | de eorum veritate, sed de modo apprehendendi illam veritatem in C, fol. 9vb
speciali, quia potest bene et male apprehendi; si enim veritas quorundam principiorum in quibusdam scientiis semper bene apprehenderetur, numquam fieret sillogismus falsigraphus quo procedit ex principiis artis male intellectis. Sicut ergo in scientiis humanis potest aliquod principium bene et male intelligi et apprehendi in speciali, ita possumus existimare in proposito de articulis fidei, nam quamvis in generali veritas unius articuli ab omnibus catholicis apprehendatur uno modo, nec quantum ad hoc cadat ibi dubitatio nec questio, in speciali tamen potest apprehendi diversis modis quorum aliqui repugnarent veritati articulorum et aliqui concordarent, et ideo quantum ad hoc cadunt ibi dubitationes, et inde formantur tamen questiones per quarum dissolutionem declaratur veritas articulorum in speciali.

Intelligendum tamen quod in toto tali processu ipsemet articulus est principium, nam quamvis in tali processu assumantur quedam alia ad declarationem articuli, semper tamen supponitur veritas articuli in generali secundum quod est nobis proposita per sacram scripturam tamquam regula et mensura totius processus, cuius signum est, quia quando volumus certificari utrum explicatio facta de articulo sit vera, statim aspicimus ad veritatem articuli propositam nobis in generali per sacram scripturam. Et si videmus quod concordet veritati articuli quam sacra scriptura proponit nobis in generali, tunc cognoscimus, et applicationem factam in speciali approbamus tamquam veram; cum vero videmus quod ab | ea discordat, tunc reprobamus et con- A, fol. 14vb
dempnamus eam tamquam falsam. Dico ergo ad formam argumenti quod querere de principiis isto modo non repugnat theologie, quia potest competere aliis scientiis.

Secundum etiam motivum est modici ponderis, nam cum dicunt nulla scientia ordinatur ad defensionem suorum principiorum, dico quod ista

---

137 potest *om*. C 138 quibusdam AB quedam C | semper *om*. B 138 apprehenderetur A apprehendere B apprehenduntur C 139 quo A quia B | artis *om*. B 140 Sicut *om*. B 141 existimare *om*. C 143 ibi dubitatio A indubitatio B 146 inde formantur tamen questiones A formantur inde questiones B formantur ibi questiones inde C 147 veritas AB veritates C 150 semper tamen AC nihilominus tamen semper B 151 proposita A proposita veritas B 152 est *om*. AB 152 certificari A certis B 153 facta de articulo A facta per articulum B de tali articulo facta C 157 reprobamus AC reprehendamus B 159 repugnat BC repugnant A

propositio videtur esse falsa, nam videmus quod metaphysica defendit sua principia et principia omnium scientiarum, sicut patet ex quarto *Metaphysice*, et totus unus tractatus ad hoc ordinatur; immo de qualibet scientia potest dici quod aliquo modo defendit sua principia, saltem implicite, nam eo ipso quod
B, fol. 19rb defendit | conclusiones elicitas ex principiis, defendit etiam et ipsa principia, quia si quis negaret conclusiones negaret etiam et ipsa principia implicite.

Ultimus potest dici quod prefata propositio solum est intelligenda de scientiis specialibus quarum consideratio sic est artata, quod si negarentur eis sua principia non habent ulterius viam ad aliquid probandum et declarandum. Scientie tamen conclusiones sicut sunt logica et metaphysica bene possunt defendere sua principia, quia earum consideratio sic est ampla, quod quicquid negatur et quicquid conceditur, totum est de earum consideratione, quapropter semper habent viam ad disputandum contra negantes sibi principia, et per consequens ad ea declarandum et roborandum.

Ita ergo poterit dici in proposito quod consideratio theologie est amplissima scientiarum, nam considerat de toto ente in quantum potest deservire ad cognitionem Dei et ad defensionem eorum que sunt fidei. Et ideo quamvis non possit sua principia probare a superiori vel a priori, sicut nec metaphysica, a posteriori tamen potest, quia ex nulla parte est sibi clausa via, cum sua consideratio sit aliquo modo de toto ente, ut dictum est. Patet ergo quod articuli fidei sunt principia istius scientie.

164 Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, IV, esp. ch. 3 (1005a-b).

164 ex *om*. C 168 etiam *om*. C 170 quarum C quorum AB | negarentur B negetur A negantur C 173 earum AB eorum C 177 Ita BC Ista A | quod BC quia A 178 nam *om*. B | ente om. C | in quantum potest deservire A ad quantum poterit servire B 179 ad defensionem *om*. C 180 a superiori *om*. AC | vel *om*. C 183 istius BC illius A